IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS BANKRUPTCY DIVISION

IN RE: § CASE NO. 22-90341-11

§ JOINTLY ADMINISTERED

§ HOUSTON, TEXAS

CORE SCIENTIFIC, INC., § THURSDAY,

§ DECEMBER 22, 2022

DEBTOR. § 9:15 A.M. TO 11:34 A.M.

FIRST DAY HEARINGS (VIA ZOOM)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID R. JONES UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES: SEE NEXT PAGE

COURTROOM DEPUTY: ALBERT ALONZO

(Recorded via CourtSpeak; Not all callers could be heard clearly.)

TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE BY:

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC 935 Eldridge Road, #144
Sugar Land, TX 77478
281-277-5325
www.judicialtranscribers.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC

APPEARANCES (VIA ZOOM):

For the Debtor:

WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP Alfredo Perez, Esq. Ray C, Schrock, PC Ronit Berkovich, Esq. Destiny Reyes, Esq. Alex Kane, Esq. Moshe Fink, Esq. 700 Louisiana, Ste. 1700 Houston, TX 77002

For the Interested Parties:

TJC PARTNERS
John Singh, Esq.

PAUL HASTINGS, LLP Kris Hansen, Esq. Erez Giland, Esq.

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP Jennifer Hardy, Esq.

PRYOR CASHMAN, LLP Matthew Silverman, Esq.

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP Matt Ferris, Esq.

KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP Chris Koenig, Esq.

SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP Dennis Twomey, Esq.

ARNOLD & PORTER Brian Lohan, Esq.

US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Jayson Ruff, Esq.

(Please also see Electronic Appearances.)

HOUSTON, TEXAS; THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 2022; 9:15 A.M.

THE COURT: Okay. Initially, good morning, everyone. This is Judge Jones. The time is 9:15 Central. Today is December 22, 2022. This is the docket for Houston, Texas.

On the 9:15 docket, we have First Day Hearings on the jointly administered cases under Case No. 22-90341, Core Scientific, Inc.

Folks, please don't forget to make your electronic appearance today. If it's been awhile, or perhaps even a first time, that's a quick trip to my website, a couple of mouse clicks. It'll take you less than 20 seconds to accomplish that, and you can do that at any time prior to the conclusion of this morning's hearing.

First time that you speak, and you only need to do it the first time, but if you would, please state your name and who you represent. It really does give the court reporter a good point of reference in the event that a transcript request is made.

And finally, we are recording this morning using CourtSpeak. We'll have the audio up on the docket, available for your download shortly after the conclusion of the hearing. Let me also say I know a number of pro hacs have been filed.

It's my belief I got them all. If I missed one, I will get it. Just don't need to worry. If you have filed a

pro hac, and I haven't signed it, you are certainly free to appear and encouraged to appear this morning, and I will come back behind, and again, if I missed one, I will pick that up.

All right. Mr. Perez, good morning. Are you starting us off?

MR. PEREZ: Yes, good morning, Your Honor. Thank you, first of all, thank you for hearing us on short notice. Also want to thank the Court staff, Mr. Alonzo, for getting this all together and getting it assigned, you know, right up to the holiday season.

And we've been working very, very cooperatively with the U.S. Trustee. Want to thank them for reaching out in their efforts, and their frankly very, very quick turnaround with respect to all of our motions.

With that, Your Honor, I was handling (indiscernible) administration which I think has been entered. So I will have to go on to Mr. Schrock who will be kind of leading us today.

In addition to Mr. Schrock, and he'll introduce the company, we have Ms. Ronit Berkovich, one of our partners, and then several of our other colleagues. Mr. Ferris, who you know, will be handling some of the First Day Motions, but with that, Your Honor, I will turn this over to Mr. Schrock for his comments.

THE COURT: Terrific. Thank you.

Mr. Schrock, good morning.

MR. SCHROCK: Good morning, Your Honor. Can you hear me okay?

THE COURT: Loud and clear. I was going to say, it looks like someone got a new pair of AirPods for Christmas, or either we've stolen the young ones. I'm just obviously joking. No, you are completely clear. Thank you.

MR. SCHROCK: Excellent. Thanks very much, Your Honor.

Just echoing Mr. Perez' comments, thanks very much for hearing us on short notice, and thanks very much to office of the United States Trustee.

I do think we're down to, I think, one issue just relating to the Chapter 7 challenge period between our proposed Debtor-in-Possession lenders and the office of the United States Trustee will make sure we're corrected on that.

Thanks for the Court staff.

And we're very pleased to be before you today, Your Honor, having sought Chapter 11 protection in the early morning hours yesterday. Your Honor, joining me here in the courtroom today, in addition to the other team members that we had mentioned for Weil, we also have my litigation partners, David Lender and Todd Becker Reeves, to the extent there are any contested matters.

They'll be handling the witness work. And we do

1 have our lead investment banker, and I believe he's on camera, 2 John Singh, from TJC Partners --3 THE COURT: Know him well. 4 MR. SCHROCK: I think he submitted it. 5 THE COURT: And as I said, know him -- I know him I know his skill set. 6 7 Good morning, Mr. Singh. 8 He hadn't hit five, star, but I read his lips. 9 MR. SINGH: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Got it. 11 MR. SCHROCK: Yeah, John, don't forget to hit five, 12 star, so you can hear me. 13 We also have Mr. Michael Brose (phonetic). He's the 14 gentleman with the Core Scientific background. He is our 15 first day declarant, and he is also in the courtroom with you 16 today. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Brose. 18 MR. SCHROCK: Your Honor, it's been a tough few days 19 here for the team to get here on the eve of the holidays, and 20 certainly Christmas for many of us. What I'd like to do is we 21 did file a first day presentation. 22 And I think it'll be helpful just to kind of set the 23 stage to take you and the parties-in-interest through it 24 without -- just to say it, without -- it's a presentation and 25 everybody can have their right to reserve, but we wanted at

least give an opportunity to present, you know, how we see the case is coming into it.

THE COURT: Certainly. Let me ask this before we get started.

Mr. Schrock, who is responsible for the Declaration filed on behalf of Mr. Brose at Docket No. 5? Was there someone who was in charge of that?

MR. SCHROCK: Yes, Your Honor. You know, I think that certainly Mr. Crabtree, you know, Ms. Berkovich, myself and Mr. Fink, you know, those are the parties that primarily were responsible.

THE COURT: So you think I'm going to criticize, but I wasn't. What I wanted to tell you, you know, obviously I've read, you know, hundreds of those things. And normally I come to one of these situations with at least some amount of personal experience.

And you know, I work my way through it, and you know, it's -- sometime, most of the time they are of limited help. This was simply the best piece of writing that I have ever read.

I spent about an hour with it, and again, you know, crypto is something when it started coming, I read everything I can find. I talked to everybody that will talk to me about it, and I often end up with more questions than I started with after I've completed that exercise.

And I will just tell you, not that this answered all of my questions. I would -- you know, whoever's the most knowledgeable, I would love to take them out after the case is over, and you know, happy hour on me because I have all sorts of questions I would love to ask.

But it is simply the most persuasive piece of writing I have ever read. I've actually sent parts of it to other lawyers, a couple of my colleagues that just says you really ought to read this.

So whoever it was that was responsible or who led the charge, it's just a nice piece of work. I wish that everything I read was just as nicely done.

So thank you.

MR. SCHROCK: Very good. It's our pleasure, Your Honor. And I also failed to mention that, you know, our associate, Destiny Reyes, you know, also played, you know, frankly a very leading role in that, and I should have called her out. And of course, I was hedging by inserting my own name in that, Your Honor. But --

THE COURT: Well, I got it. You were protecting your team. That's why I could tell. I appreciated you doing that.

MR. SCHROCK: Exactly.

THE COURT: I got it. So let me -- who do I need -- MR. SCHROCK: Okay.

1 THE COURT: -- to give presentation control to? 2 MR. SCHROCK: I believe that would be Austin 3 Crabtree should be getting that control, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Hold on a second. 5 (Pause in the proceedings.) 6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Crabtree --7 MR. SCHROCK: Great. 8 THE COURT: -- should have control. 9 MR. SCHROCK: Okay. Great. All right. Looks like 10 we're getting the full screen mode. Let's go ahead and flip 11 the page, please, Austin, and the next page. 12 So Your Honor, just a little bit of background about 13 the company. 14 I know a lot of this is covered in the First Day 15 The company was founded in 2017, and the Declaration. 16 company's revenue stream was from bitcoin that it mined from 17 film account and for variety hosting services to third party 18 customers. 19 They -- you know, since its inception, the Debtors 20 have built a considerable asset base of approximately 180,000 21 miners, or computers. They've gained market trust. 22 I believe they're one of the, if not the leading 23 miner here in the United States. And this company unlike, you 24 know, I would say, you know, some of the companies that we

have the pleasure of working with, it is cashflow positive

25

before debt service.

It mines bitcoin. It converts that bitcoin into cash. And it has been, you know, in the past, in the very recent past very significantly cashflow positive. It's just had a cascading series of events that have hit it over the very recent past.

Its most profitable business segment comes from mining bitcoin with machines that it owns that they're self-mining. It also has posting for many other companies and it sold wholesale computers. The miners take care of them and will be provided a fixed case.

We have eight fully operational data centers, all located in the U.S. Those are in Texas, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina and North Dakota.

We've got a couple of large transactions that were undertaken prior to commencing these cases, including acquiring one of our largest customers, Block Cat. And that's significantly increased the number of miners.

We also entered into a spec merger during which the company merged with a company and changed its name to Core Scientific. And after going public at the start of 2022, we experienced tremendous growth.

You know, market conditions and the price of bitcoin, the price of power and many other things went to the company to refocus our efforts in resource and self-mining.

And we've had some challenges over, you know, the third and fourth quarters that we will take through as well.

Next page, please.

So for me personally, Your Honor, this was a helpful page, not being, you know, fully factual in, you know, what it is that bitcoin mining is. And you know, admittedly when we first started working with the company, I had to question like how do you even mine, you know, a bitcoin? How does this actually take place? This diagram, you know -- it simply is a, you know, when people engage in the transaction, they, you know, have to have that transaction validated.

It then is that block chain that's broadcast out to all of the mining nodes across the world, and there's effectively, you know, a competition to see who can complete the algorithm quickly and the fastest in order to prove out the transaction.

And those who are first, you know, in fact, you know, get rewarded with a piece of bitcoin. So the ingenious system is something that has become, you know, certainly part of the contemporary lexicon, but it is something that also happens to be an extremely profitable business.

So this business has, you know, a large amount of significant, not just digital assets, but also real assets that support bitcoin mining.

JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC

Next page, please.

You know, the competition and economic effect of bitcoin mining really feed on itself to, you know, cause, you know, some of the issues that we're dealing with.

You know, if you get more miners and they increase competition, that increases the overall cost of bitcoin mine including power that, you know, as we saw earlier this year, power costs were a big part during the summer of, and into the fall of what was causing these issues, and certainly the cascading series of events relating to bitcoin.

But when you put all of these things in here, it's a relatively simple business model that we've outlined in the diagram below. And in addition, to control the supply of bitcoin, the reward amount for solving the algorithm increases over time as more bitcoins have been released into the market, and there are fewer bitcoins left to be mined. It's a fixed supply.

And the next big event in this industry -- not the next one, but one of them is certainly there's another having event where they have the number of bitcoins that are actually available that's coming up certainly next year.

You know, determining, you know, what effect that's going to have on the company, I think it depends on who you talk to, but I think that, you know, many people believe that you reduce the supply of bitcoin, the price of bitcoin should theoretically increase.

And you know, certainly the believers and the investors in this company, the creditors in this company, I think a lot of people believe that listen, this is what's going to happen.

Has that always happened in the past, not necessarily, but this particular industry becomes so sophisticated over such a quick period of time, that there's a lot of thought and resources that certainly go into it, and it's really quite amazing.

You know, this is a type of business that even just a few years ago we wouldn't think exists, and now we have, you know, couple hundred employees, you know, significant number of investors here, and people that, you know, are really behind this business.

We think this company and we are confident that there's a tremendous amount of interest in reorganizing this company. We will reorganize pursuant to Chapter 11, and we'll take you through an RSA that, you know, is subject to a slot for materiality that we believe could put us in the position to even have even better offers and better opportunities for our stakeholders.

Let's go ahead and flip the page then.

So this is an overview of our capital structure which is relatively simple. You know, we have two convertible notes tranches. They are secured.

There's some peculiar aspects of those private notes that we don't have to get into today, but I'm sure will be discussed further on in the future. We have a lot of miner equipment financing, and a lot of those already -- you know, we were extremely active with -- in the weeks leading up to, and month leading up to these cases.

There's, you know, various interest rates behind these. You know, it depends on -- you know, if you can imagine with computers, it really depends on the type of computer, how new they are, how fast they are as to how much they're going to be worth.

We've been working with them cooperatively and in fact, we were trying to negotiate a couple of different transactions leading up to these cases. But there was a high degree of dialogue with those parties.

We also have some non-miner financing, relatively small amounts. There's an unsecured note owed to B. Riley, and you know, there was certainly a lot of interaction with Mr. Riley, and it was being -- leading up to these cases.

We have an unsecured loan, which is called the Novak loan. And just to look -- give you an impression just how profitable this company was in the recent past. The EBITDA was 358 million, as of just six months ago. We think that, you know, as of the recent past, and lowers, you know, significantly.

We haven't announced public results so I don't want to get too far in front of the company on that. But you know, there's other significant liabilities that we are dealing with. The company, due to its explosive growth, had very significant construction commitments.

There's a number of parties out there, and so you have to front load all of these costs, get the miners online and then begin producing. Simply all of the cap fees series of events that were facing the company, those constructions got ahead of us.

We were in discussions with literally many, many parties in the weeks leading up to these cases about certain construction liens across various space, including our noteholders. And then we have various litigation and disputed liabilities that, you know, we were dealing with leading up to these cases.

But this is really a classic case in my view, Your Honor, where we simply -- we had so many things that the company was dealing with so quickly that, you know, we had to get the Court's protection in order to get this company -- to save the company, to get it reorganized.

We tried so hard to get this done out of court, but at the end of the day, the Special Committee that was formed made a determination, one that we strongly agree with, that was the right to do this was an open and transparent fashion, you know, to get the company reorganized and to save the company from what was really kind of a cascading series of defaults that we'll talk a little bit about.

Okay, next page then.

So some of the key parties, Mr. Levitt, the chairman of the board, Chief Executive Officer, someone of extremely high integrity that we've been working with over the last few months.

Chief Legal Officer and President, Todd Duchene, senior vice president, the capital market and acquisitions, Mr. Brodis (phonetic). The Special Committee was apprised of three members, the independent members, Jarvis Hollingsworth, Neil and Youngblood, two Texans, and Neil Goldman that has also been committee member, I know, on a number of Chapter 11 cases.

The main players with whom we were negotiating prepetition include the ad hoc convertible noteholders, Paul Hastings, lead by Mr. Hansen, and Moelis, Mr. Brock Klein, as well as equipment lenders from a number of firms, some of which have filed notices of appearance here today.

B. Riley is represented by Willkie Farr, and Celsius is represented by Kirkland and Ellis. I think a number of attorneys need to file notices of appearance. There is a very significant dispute in our -- you know, leading up to these cases, over the interpretation of that contract.

Celsius is obviously is in its own bankruptcy case in front of Judge Glenn, in the Southern District of New York.

And I'm sure, you know -- listen, we're looking forward to engaging with them as we move forward.

I think it's fair to say we've had our differences in the recent past, but we are -- we're going to look forward and see if we can find a path forward that obviously minimizes expense.

But I just wanted, you know, to give a quick shout out. I really do thank Mr. Hansen, the Moelis team, for, you know, working with us over the last several days. It's been last several weeks.

You know, they've been very good partners. They have been flexible. They've worked with the company in, you know -- under very difficult circumstances. And you know, we do really appreciate that on behalf of the company or involved in the industry.

Let's go ahead and flip it, please.

So the circumstances in just a little bit more about this. The climb in the price of bitcoin, the increase in power costs, the Celsius nonpayment of related litigation, you know, why I first became involved, you know, when this dispute was really coming into full view during October.

And you know, this was certainly -- it was a very difficult situation. I think that Celsius felt very strongly,

or feels very strongly about their interpretation of the contract.

I think it's less of an issue now because frankly, if we, you know, can't work it out, then that means we satisfactorily (indiscernible). You know, they understand that we have powers of rejection, you know, related to a hosting agreement.

I don't think that that's something they would seriously contest. But that particular issue was causing the company to lose, you know, millions of dollars per month because of -- due to the power pass through issues that were in dispute in that contract.

It fluctuates of course because the price of power fluctuates. You know, the pass through can be a huge problem one month is you're unhedged on power. It could be not as big of a problem the next month.

The price of power's come down recently as we've entered the colder season, but you know, could very well go up as we end up in the truly cold weather season. The significant construction costs which, you know, with myriad counterparties is also a big problem.

And you know, the high equipment financing indebtedness and in particular, amortization payments that we were facing was also a huge problem for us. We had to stop making those amortization payments in late October, with a lot

of miners.

We were working with them to try and find solutions, but even as we were working on out of court solutions, we did have one very significant liability accelerate in the days leading up to these cases.

That caused a corresponding profit fall, even if we sent -- you know, would cause profits to fall under the convertible note, and you know, that was certainly a significant factor for us as we considered, you know, what path do we have to go down here to get the company protected?

And then I think just the litigation and other debts, this is something where we have so many disputes out there, we need the automatic stay, to be very frank. We need the Court's protection to give the company a chance to be able to look at these things, to move forward.

Okay, let's go ahead and flip, please.

So the only thing I want to mention here, Your Honor, that we haven't talked about, and it's actually not on the page. But we also were looking at, and had serious interests in, you know, selling non-Core assets.

And I think that there are some assets in the way of certain facilities that we may be able to actually generate some very significant amounts. But I think there was not time, the real estate and real property listed.

And I know that our estate counterparties when we

did execute the RSA in the early morning hours today, they have consent rights under the terms of the DIP financing to consent to those.

But we are confident there's real buyers out there that certainly we could be working with as part of this process. And unlike many of our, you know, other cases, you know, we did have unencumbered assets coming into these cases.

The convertible noteholders had the means on, you know, certain soft -- you know, personal property, UCC-1 protected property I would say in large part. But the real property of the company is unencumbered largely.

And you know, it takes both of things obviously to generate enterprise value for an operation like this. And the equipment financiers have liens on the equipment. Convertible noteholders have liens on certain assets, and then we had unencumbered assets coming into it.

So there's going to be many interested parties that I think have a vested interest in seeing this company reorganize. I think people have strong views about where the value lies related to this company.

But we're looking forward to continuing our prepetition negotiations, and you know, bringing these
negotiations to a conclusion and get this company reorganized,
you know, for the benefit of all stakeholders.

Scrolling, keep flipping, yes.

So we did sign a Restructure Support Agreement and it does have, I believe, more than two-thirds of the convertible note tranches that are supporting it.

We outlined the claims that are there. The DIP financing, which is going to be -- we're going to turn to next. I will leave that primarily to Ms. Berkovich to explain to you exactly where we wind up on the terms which were moving, and you know, being finalized right up until prior to this hearing.

But it does provide for up to \$75 million in new money. It contemplates a roll up, but only at the final DIP hearing. The interest rates are set forth there and the fees are also set forth as part of the DIP financing.

The bad (indiscernible) the company is desperately in need of financing. We need to get the financing approved, the company needs access to that capital because frankly the company is -- you know, the cash balance is almost at zero.

Going -- flip, please.

Under the terms of Restructure Support Agreement, there's exit term loans that we can entered into, you know. If we're unable to obtain an exit term loan facility, we can roll up the DIP facility into an exit facility.

There's mortgage exit financing that can't exceed 45 million, to secure the company's debt in the Texas data center. And the company has the option to terminate this deal

if it's inconsistent with its fiduciary duty.

The fiduciary duty of, you know, termination of that was something that is as it always is, is subject of a high amount of negotiation. It was extremely important to the company especially in light of how we had to commence these cases.

But you know, I think we'll see if any other further opportunities present themselves, and certainly we hope they do.

There's various termination rights that are there that are pretty standard.

No, let's go ahead, Austin, you can flip the page.

The convertible notes, here's the treatment,

97 percent that will be found and shared from a solution by
the DIP (indiscernible) to the new. There's paid back debt
for the miner equipment financing that the amounts are their
secured collateral value.

We do believe that many of the miners are significantly under secured. I think that'll be something that, you know, is going to be something we're going to have to work on over the near term just to see how those claims are going to be treated.

We'd like to reinstate the non-equipment financing to standard secured claim treatment. The general and secured treatment is set forth there. There's a concept for

management incentive plan for up to 10 percent of new common shares.

And then we do have the opportunity at various value levels for significant warrant packages for value to be shared with existing common stakeholders. That was also something that we were fighting very strongly for, and we are looking forward to see if we can try and improve those terms should the situation (indiscernible).

Flip, please.

The milestones are set forth here. One thing is certain about the milestones, I'm certain they'll change.

They're always going to be subject to what the Court believes, and we'll have to see how the circumstances fold out, or unfold in these cases.

Right now, we're contemplating a six-month case.

And you know, with any commodity based case, I think it's worth just emphasizing, you know, a lot of the value of this company is dependent on the price of bitcoin.

So I don't think anybody can predict at the moment, at least nobody I know, of what the price of bitcoin is going to be, you know, a month out, let alone six months out. So we're going to have to be flexible moving forward.

We certainly hope the price of the bitcoin goes up significantly, and it gives, you know, the company a chance to distribute further value. But we'll frankly -- we're just

going to have to see how that goes as we move forward.

And then looks like -- flip to the next one.

So you know, what's our path forward? We want to pursue the Restructure Support Agreement. I think that there were any altered (indiscernible) if they present themselves. We are also going to pursue the sale in cooperation with our convertible noteholder partners the sales of non-Core assets.

We'll address (indiscernible) the stakeholder disputes and related settlements, I think including the Celsius and other parties. And frankly just proceed with a Plan of Reorganization and emergence.

So it's a relatively straightforward path forward. We'll see how easy it becomes, or how hard it becomes as we move forward, but Your Honor, I'm happy to answer any questions, or I'm prepared to try to move the evidence in, in support of the relief we're seeking today.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schrock.

I do have just one question, and it just sort of -- as I look at the timing and I try to get a general feel for things. This -- oh, I agree with you.

This all seems relatively straightforward with the exception of, you know, dealing with the valuation issues with the equipment financiers. Are you contemplating some sort of expedited process, you want to try to wait?

I don't know how you'd do that, but are you trying

to wait till after confirmation? Did you have thoughts on that, just as I try to work through the schedule because I will tell you, the schedule doesn't bother me all.

My view is it's actually too long. But I also understand that, you know, there are whole host of issues that you're trying to plan. I got all of that. All I'm trying to convey is I do think that the company's better off, the employees are better off, the process is better off to the extent that the company is going to survive, is that it get out sooner rather than later.

And so I'm telling you that I'm prepared for a process that's quicker than the one that you outlined. It's also not going to bother me if it turned out to be longer because those are just things that happen.

But I am -- when I read through everything, the one thing that stuck out at me is it is a big issue is how do you deal with the valuation issue on the equipment financiers?

MR. SCHROCK: It's a great question, Your Honor. If I could just give a couple points to that?

So one of the first issues that may present itself,

I think there would be (indiscernible) related to the

equipment financiers would -- you know, we contemplated ask

for a protection package for the equipment financiers that's

allowed under the terms of the DIP financing.

There's been a lot of reservations of rights that

have already been filed, and I think that between the interim Order and the Final Order, there's going to have to be some discussions with those equipment financiers to see exactly what are we going to do, is there going to be a change in terms, are we going to have a dispute?

You know, and it's unique to each equipment financier, you know, what their -- you know, how they should be treated. I also think that, you know, we're certainly going to come to a point here, and we hope to work this out consensually.

But I think depending on how those initial negotiations or discussions go, and then moving forward with a plan, you know, we are going to have to determine, you know, the value of their collateral in conjunction with the plan process.

I don't have a straight answer for you, Your Honor, about when precisely we would do that, but I, you know, think that there's so many parties, you know, and in this world that are interested in the company including potentially some of those equipment financiers.

You know, it's an ecosystem that depends upon one another. You know, for all I know, some of those parties may be interested in investing in the company in one form or another. And I think with Celsius, with whom, you know, we're hosting a significant number of companies.

They are also, I should note, one of our largest convertible noteholders, and they, you know, certainly expressed an interest in trying to have discussions with us related to what's going to happen to their machines, and you know, are we going to continue hosting, if so, on what terms, how is all that going to work out?

But I think, Your Honor, hopefully as between now and the second day hearing, we can lay out in conjunction with our RSA parties a process for you that will bring it forward in an organized fashion, you know, to determine the value of that collateral.

Right now, we think it's significantly under secured. I'm sure they have different views about that, and I'd probably leave it there.

THE COURT: Fair enough. All I was really trying to convey, as the parties start to talk, and I do realize that each particular party may be a distinct case. I am -- you know, this is not something that is going to be foreign to me.

It's relatively easy for me, from my point of view. And to the extent that perhaps Rule 7001 implicates the outcome and the parties are willing to proceed under 9014, you know, happy to do that.

I am more than happy to create an expedited process that reserves the rights of everybody, but to get an answer to some of this relatively quickly because I do think that it's

important, and I do think that it drives perhaps at least part of this.

I may be completely wrong, but happy to entertain all of that. It's not going to bother me, surprise me, and I look forward to you all continuing to talk because I do agree there probably do need to be some more discussions.

I just simply was trying to convey to everyone, I am going to be incredibly flexible in terms of coming up with a process that gets some of those answers because I don't think we can really get -- I don't think we can know what the end looks like until we get some of those issues resolved. That's all I was trying to convey.

And with respect to the Celsius issue, again happy to drive that on an expedited schedule. Obviously I want to be -- and I don't follow Celsius, nor do I talk to Judge Glenn, not for any reason, other than I just won't talk to him.

I obviously don't want to step down on Judge Glenn's process, but to the extent that, you know, that end is covered, and the parties want to have an expedited process to try and move that issue forward.

I don't really see that as important as I do the equipment financiers. I obviously may be wrong, but I'm going to be open there again so long as you respect Judge Glenn's process in his case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you.

MR. SCHROCK:

MR. SCHROCK: No, heard loud and clear, Your Honor. And you know, on Celsius, we were actually going to go to trial over an equipment interpretation issue and the Celsius Chapter 11. We agreed, you know, consensually with the team, that listen, looks put it off, just in light of everything that's going on with Core Scientific. You know, I'm not sure if that's really going to be necessary to have that trial at this point, just given that, you know, there -- it's one thing to interpret the contract. I think it's another thing if we can't work it out to just -to deal with rejection issues. And so I think that we're still talking. We have a good relationship with the team and we'll certainly move forward, you know, in an efficient manner as possible, but I think that, you know, there should be an opportunity for people to speak. THE COURT: We could have a joint hearing with Jones and Glenn. That would be exciting for everybody. (Laughter.) MR. SCHROCK: Yes, it would. Yes, it would, Judge. We'll try and avoid that, but I will -- that would be exciting. THE COURT: No, I was just having a little fun with

So --

THE COURT: Let's -- before we go to Ms. Berkovich, let me just take a pause and see does anyone else want to make what I'll just take as opening comments, or just a statement of where you see the case going, or particular problems you want to highlight for me?

And again, if haven't already done so --

MR. HANSEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hansen, I'm happy to start with you.

I don't think I've seen you since the big event.

Congratulations to you and your team.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you very much, Your Honor. I do appreciate that. It's nice to see you again. I just wanted to take a minute and introduce you to who we are in this one. So first, I also want to say thank you to Wild (indiscernible) teams.

We've all been really hard at work over the last couple of weeks as Mr. Schrock pointed out to bring the case to this point. As you know, these things are at least quite chaotic. There's a lot of people in the hearing today who haven't slept very much, not only last night, but for the past couple of nights.

And so I just again wanted to convey our gratitude to everybody around the teams. It's been an all hands effort. I was going to try to take credit for the First Day Declaration, but you know, you beat me to it.

So Your Honor, I'd also just want to introduce quickly who we are in the case. So the convertible notes were issued by the company, obviously pre-petition in connection with the build out of their platform.

The holders of those notes, and we represent more than 75 percent of the two tranches of those notes, together more than 80 percent of the August tranche, and more than 58 percent of the (indiscernible) tranche. And we have signed up to the RSA as Mr. Schrock pointed out. So those two tranches of notes are working together. They've hired us as their counsel, and (indiscernible) as their investment banker.

And I want -- it's not the usual case where we show up and we say that 100 percent of the holders of these notes were the original purchasers of these notes, Your Honor. And I think that's important for you to understand because the speed in which the crypto currency world writ large, so to speak, has been impacted over the course of the last couple of quarters. It has resulted in an awful lot of tumult for these businesses. And so people believed in this business, they invested in this business as original holders, and they still hold those notes.

And so it's not been fun for them to see where the price of the coin is right now, and to see what happened with respect to the company. And so for them to come together and not only support this restructuring, but also be prepared to

write a money check into it from a DIP lending perspective because they're also serving in the capacity of DIP lenders, is a real testament to their desire to stick to this process, and their belief in the future of the company.

However, they also know that this company has sustained an extraordinarily volatile larger universe. You only need to look at the price of bitcoin and where it's been and where it is now.

There's lots of hopeful people that hope it'll go back in the other direction. But we aren't in the future, we're in the now. And I think for our clients, you know, when you look at the terms of the DIP, or we look at the terms of the restructuring in total, those are very fair terms, given the volatility that's associated with the marketplace and what this company plays.

And so that's really all I wanted to say, Your

Honor. And I also wanted to introduce my partners who are

with me as well. You'll see Mr. Collett (phonetic). He is in

one of boxes over here on my computer.

So (indiscernible) Collett over there. And you'll see my other partner, Cheyenne (indiscernible) who is in the other box. They'll probably be doing most of the talking at the hearing today which I know you can't believe. But I will probably cede the mic to them for the bulk of it.

So nice to see you again, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Got it. Thank you, and good morning to the team.

Anyone else? Ms. Hardy, I saw you pop on, and I'll ask you, did you have any opening comments that you wanted to make? And you --

MS. HARDY: Yes, Your Honor, very quickly. Jennifer Hardy of Willkie Farr, on behalf of B. Riley, financed secured noteholder in these cases.

Your Honor, I'd like wholly to reserve all rights with respect to the final DIP here.

There are aspects of the DIP which are problematic, particularly as an unsecured creditor, the one (indiscernible) the roll up. You know, as Mr. Schrock mentioned in his opening presentation, there are substantial unencumbered assets here.

And those, that value would be swallowed by essentially 100 percent fee on the DIP borrowing. But you know, it's that, and other issues are issues for the final hearing, and would certainly be subject to close scrutiny by the Creditors Committee. We're not formally objecting to today's relief, but just want to put that reservation on the Record.

THE COURT: Fair enough, Ms. Hardy, and I look forward to B. Riley submitting a far better and cheaper DIP.

MS. HARDY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

I think I saw Mr. Silverman?

MR. SILVERMAN: That's right, Your Honor. This is Matthew Silverman, Pryor Cashman. Good to see you this morning, Your Honor. Good morning.

Your Honor, I represent (indiscernible). It is a digital asset mining company and a customer of the Debtor, third party hosting services.

We are involved in a pre-petition litigation with the Debtor which is noted in the Debtor's First Day

Declaration. The suit involves claims in excess of

\$35 million tied to a deposit that was paid to the Debtor.

But curiously, the Debtor didn't include (indiscernible) on their top 30 creditor list despite the fact that (indiscernible) was brought in at I believe number two on that list, haven't been included.

I raised this issue with Debtor's counsel prior to the hearing. I haven't received a subsequent response on that yet. That said, (indiscernible) doesn't object to any of the relief sought today. I rise merely to introduce ourselves to the Court, and note that we intend to be an active participant in these cases.

THE COURT: And number one, thank you, and I assume that if you hadn't already reached out to Mr. Ruff, he now knows that you exist, and he's made a note about that. So I

appreciate you're doing that. All right.

MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Anyone else?

MR. FERRIS: Yes, Your Honor. Can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Go ahead, please.

MR. FERRIS: Good morning, Your Honor, Matt Ferris, Haynes and Boone, on behalf of BlockFi. We are one of the mining equipment lenders in this case, and this is mentioned in the papers.

And as Your Honor may be aware, we are a leading crypto currency lender that is subject to our own capital lending proceeding that's currently pending in the district of New Jersey.

And I mention that only because we are very much in this industry and are a sophisticated party, and as reflected in the First Day Declaration and other papers, Your Honor, we currently have -- it's really two that collectively have a principal balance of approximately \$54 million, which are secured by approximately 14,500 of these AS IC mining machines.

We are one of a member of this group. As Debtor's noted, we are not all exactly in the same situation. But we did very quickly mobilize as a group yesterday, and began to try to coordinate efforts on identifying our concerns with respect to the DIP and the first day rulings request, to make

this as efficient as a process as possible.

We've been engaging with the Debtors as a group, and I think as a result of that, we've been able to narrow the issues pretty substantially for today. I don't speak on behalf of the other lenders, but I have been tapped with because we are similarly situated, trying to coordinate our comments so that we don't all have the stand up and rise and repeat the same comments.

I will say, and I'll reserve my comments for the DIP motion which -- that relates to the DIP motion, there are some open issues with respect to the DIP motion. I did just want to say for purposes of today's hearing though, you know, one of the overarching concerns from our standpoint is -- well, one of them of course is the issue that you bring, the valuation issue, Your Honor.

And we do think that's going to be an important issue, and we don't necessarily agree with the value that the Debtors have put forth, but we will take that issue up in due course.

A second overarching issue for us is adequate protection, and there is a adequate protection package provided in the DIP Order that is in the form of a (indiscernible). So we could talk more about it when we get into the DIP Order itself.

But the DIP budget does not have any provision for

payment of monetary adequate protection. We confirmed with Debtor's counsel that they do not anticipate making monetary adequate protection payments at this point.

And as reflected in the Debtor's papers, you know, they are in crypto currency mining business. They intend to use our equipment, collateral on a go-forward basis. The DIP budget shows that they intend to fund a substantial portion of this case with proceeds of, you know, the coins mined from using that equipment collaterally.

And we believe, my client believes, Your Honor, that there is a, you know, tangible and demonstrable diminution of value that occurs every day that this equipment is used. Obviously there's a diminution value that's related to physical use.

My understanding is these -- this equipment typically run 24 hours a day, and so there's just a natural physical deterioration that happens. Of course, we're talking about tech equipment so there's a performance obsolescence aspect to this as well as new technology comes online.

There's also an issue of each piece of mining equipment is housed in its proportional share of bitcoin as I understand it, Your Honor. And as there's even more mining equipment, or a reduction in the available bitcoin which you heard Debtor's counsel reference a halving of the available bitcoin to be mined in April, 2023, that obviously reduces the

proportionate value of each piece of mining equipment.

And then of course, there's more supply and demand issue, and there's more of this equipment available for sale.

That has a corresponding effect on the value of the collateral.

So all that's to say, Your Honor, we believe adequate protection is an important issue. We believe that it needs to be addressed. We don't feel that what has been proposed in the interim DIP Order is a sufficient adequate protection package.

We've already had some preliminary discussions with the Debtors and the DIP lender's counsel about this issue. We've all committed to work constructively on this, on a go-forward basis, so we're not going to hold up the hearing today on this issue.

But I do want to mention it because, you know, obviously this is a time sensitive issue for us. The longer this process goes, and we don't have resolution on adequate protection, you know, the more we believe our position is impaired, particularly given that the Debtor's position is that we are significantly under collateralized already.

So you know, we will work diligently to try to resolve these issues consensually over the coming days and weeks. But to the extent we're not able to do that, we very well may have to come back before your Court on a motion for

adequate protection.

With that, Your Honor, I'll reserve my comments on the DIP, for the actual -- taking that up.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. FERRIS: Thank you.

THE COURT: So Mr. Ferris, so that you know, I mean
I am sensitive to these issues. I do understand the
degradation that occurs when electronic equipment is running.
I also understand the degradation of electronic equipment when
you turn the power off.

So I've got all of that, and the commitment that I was trying to convey when -- obviously, you guys are all super great at what you do. But when you hit loggerheads, don't wait. I am ready to jump in and deal with this issue.

And I do understand the critical nature of the issue, and that everybody needs to know where they stand. So the commitment I was trying, when I was responding to Mr. Schrock, the commitment that I'm making to him, to you, to all those in the same situation, I am ready to go on that issue because I understand how important it is.

And as soon -- if you all can agree on a process, you know, I will do my best to accommodate. If I need to clear time, and obviously the sooner you can let Mr. Alonzo know that a problem is coming, the harder I can work to try to create the time to try and resolve some of these issues.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So number one, I hear you loud and clear, and I'm ready to go as soon as your -- and I'm sorry to say, your clients, your group. And I got the position that you're in today. MR. FERRIS: Appreciate that. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Is there anyone else? MR. KOENIG: Good morning, Your Honor. MR. TWOMEY: Good morning, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I think I saw Mr. Koenig first. Mr. Koenig, good morning. MR. KOENIG: Good morning, Your Honor. Chris Koenig, from Kirkland & Ellis on behalf of Celsius Mining, LLC, and its affiliated Debtors and Debtors-in-Possession with a case pending in Southern District of New York. Prior to its bankruptcy filing, Celsius ran one of the largest bitcoin currency platforms in the world. addition to that, retail customer base included in this, Celsius also owns and operates one of the largest crypto mining businesses in the United States through Celsius mining.

Celsius has continued its mining operations following our own Chapter 11 filing, in the ordinary course of business. As Mr. Schrock, we're one of their largest convertible noteholders as well.

We have \$54 million of the convert, which is about 10 percent of the issuance. And as Mr. Schrock previewed, we have an ongoing contractual dispute before about provisions in the contract (indiscernible) passed the power charges to us.

We filed a motion in our case, they filed a motion for evidence (indiscernible) in our case. We mutually agreed to abate that litigation to see if we could come to sort of consensual resolution given, among other things, for financial distress.

And of course, in light of Core's own Chapter 11 filing, I understand and appreciate Mr. Schrock's comments that this litigation and disagreement about the contract may be irrelevant given the powers that Core now has.

So to be clear, Celsius is focused on the long term future of Core. We remain ready to engage with Core, and now that they've filed for bankruptcy, see if there's a mutually agreeable path forward.

We appreciate Mr. Schrock's comments about looking to the future, and we feel exactly the same way. As one of the largest noteholders, and customers, we're very invested and continue to (indiscernible) Core. We've been a little bit

on the outside up to this point.

I think in part because of the multiple hats that we wear as both a customer and a large noteholder. And obviously we've had litigation with them recently. But from our perspective, it's imperati-forward strategy here.

We look forward to engaging with the Core Debtors more (indiscernible) the parties. We don't expect to object to any of the interim relief today, but we just wanted to (indiscernible) and introduce ourselves to the Court.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Koenig, number one, I appreciate you doing that, too. You've been in here before. You know how I react when you're -- when you see something that you think would make the process more efficient, or achieve any sort of an advantage in terms of efficiency, I encourage and expect you to speak up.

And I again want to be respectful of Judge Glenn's case, but I again, you know I don't like form over substance. I want to get to the heart of the matter. And you see an issue that's, you know -- needs to be resolved, I'm here, and I expect you to ask.

MR. KOENIG: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. We understand the procedure comment. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. I think there was someone else that was behind Mr. Koenig. Let me just -- anyone else?

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Twomey, I was hoping to hear from you.

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, good morning, Judge Jones. I appreciate it. Dennis Twomey with Sidley Austin, on behalf of (indiscernible) LLC. We did file a short reservation of rights shortly before the hearing.

And I'm guessing Your Honor has read that based on some of the comments that Your Honor has already made, which we really appreciate. As noted, Your Honor, we're not today objecting to approval of the DIP on an interim basis.

But we do have an issue that you've already really focused in on, and frankly Mr. Schrock and Mr. Ferris have, too, so I won't go through it all again. And it's really the point that we want to, you know, highlight is adequate protection here.

And we appreciate your willingness to see that it is an important issue, and it's somewhat urgent. You know, not something obviously that we brought before Your Honor today, but it is an urgent issue in the sense that the equipment does tend to diminish in value, maybe more than some other equipment that we often see in these types of cases.

So we really appreciate the comments that you've already made. The only other point I wanted to just mention for Your Honor, and you've already observed this, too, is that, and as did Mr. Schrock, that not all of the equipment

lenders are in the same position.

We do believe that (indiscernible) just based on the information, the First Day Declaration likely has, you know, relatively speaking the best collateralized of the equipment loans in the sense that it has more a fixed, relative to the outstanding loan amounts than other parties.

And so, you know, that's the position we're in. We have not quite as much although, you know, we're happy to do whatever is most efficient for this process. We have not really been speaking a whole lot with the other equipment lenders at this point.

We certainly have pre-petition discussions with the Weil team and appreciate those and look forward to continuing that, you know, as we move forward here, and the issue that is, you know, highest in our mind is the one that we've already talked about and other parties have talked about here.

So we are going to be looking to see if we can get those issues solved in the, you know, coming days and weeks so that we can get the process moving quickly one way or another on that.

And so the only other thing is just to note what everyone else has already noted, we do have some other issues potentially with the DIP financing which we're not going to get into today in part because we still need to get some answers to some of our questions.

And so we'll just reserve our rights on all of those issues for the final hearing, and look forward to speaking with the Weil team and others here in the coming days and weeks.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Twomey, thank you. And again, I did focus on your objection and the issues that are raised. I want to take just a moment and -- because I don't think -- if you have, I don't remember.

But I don't think you've appeared before me yet, and I wanted to just tell you and all others that are in the same boat, Albert Alonzo is my case manager. His cell phone and email address are posted on my website.

He is your vehicle to tell me that you need court time. I do not ever want my schedule to be the reason that the case can't progress. So if you need something, and you need scheduling, you know what not to talk to the Court staff about. And I depend on that degree of professionalism. But he's there, use him. The folks who do this on a regular basis here, I think will tell you, he's probably the best part of my court, me included.

And so just being able to reach out to him and tell him what you need in terms of timing, or that something's coming, or whatever it is, you know, he's there, and he's part of the overall service.

MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

I really appreciate that, and I have had some dealings with him in the past, in connection with mediation rather than hearings, but everything you have described is absolutely consistent with my dealings with him in the past. So greatly appreciate that, and his willingness to help here.

THE COURT: Of course, thank you.

Anyone else before we go to Ms. Berkovich?

MR. LOHAN: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.

THE COURT: Morning.

MR. LOHAN: Brian Lohan, Arnold Porter, on behalf of Barings.

I only raised to introduce myself in variance to the Court. We are an equipment lender. We have attempted to kind of streamline our comments with Mr. Ferris, for purposes of keeping this morning's hearing efficient.

We've worked with Ms. Berkovich and Mr.

(indiscernible) last night late, and this morning. I think

we've resolved a lot of our issues. There may be a couple

open issues that require clarification when we get to the DIP

motion itself, regarding the, you know, DIP lenders not

priming the equipment lenders' names.

But we really tried to kind of reserve our rights and kick to the final hearing the issues that can be dealt with at the final hearing. But I just want to introduce

```
1
       myself to the Court, and Mr. Ferris will likely address the
2
       Court when it comes to the DIP motion for our case.
3
                 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lohan.
4
                 And again, one, I appreciate you doing that, and
5
       two, did I say anything this morning that surprised you or
6
       caused you heartburn?
                 MR. LOHAN: No, Your Honor. I think the Record and
8
       the discussion we've had in the past hour is very much
9
       expected to this case, and how to proceed.
10
                 Thank you.
11
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
12
                 Anyone else?
13
            (No audible response.)
14
                 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Berkovich?
15
                 MR. SCHROCK: Your Honor, it's Mr. Schrock.
16
       one last point I have before we turn it over. I think I was
17
       supposed to move in the Declaration into evidence before we
18
       turn it over to Ms. Berkovich. But I'm prepared to do that.
19
                 THE COURT: My apologies. Go ahead.
20
                 MR. SCHROCK: No. So Your Honor, (glitch in the
21
       audio) --
22
                 THE COURT: Mr. Schrock, I think we lost you, and
23
       for whatever reason it was very broken, and I'm not sure we
24
       heard you.
25
                 MR. SCHROCK: Yeah, I (indiscernible) into evidence.
```

1 Say again, Your Honor? THE COURT: So I was going -- I was trying to tell 3 Let me ask you. Are you connected, are you using like a 4 voice over internet to actually dial in? 5 MR. SCHROCK: I may have been, Your Honor. Can you hear me now? 6 7 THE COURT: I can hear you now, yes, because your 8 video broke right with your sound so I was thinking it was the 9 same string. But I can hear you now. So I think what you 10 were doing, I think what I heard was you offered in Mr. Brose 11 Declaration at number five, and that's where we lost you. 12 And now we've really lost him. 13 MR. SCHROCK: Let somebody handle it. Sorry, go 14 ahead. 15 MR. PEREZ: All right. Your Honor, Alfredo Perez. 16 Your Honor, we would move in those two Declarations, 17 Mr. Brose, and Mr. Singh's Declaration that was filed a bit 18 earlier before the hearing. 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 20 Now we've got Perez on evidence. We have reached 21 new highs. Let me --22 MR. SCHROCK: Nobody (glitch in the audio) 23 Declaration though. 24 THE COURT: All right. So let me ask first. We'll 25 do them one by one. Any objection to the admission of

```
1
       Mr. Brose Declaration found at docket entry number five?
2
            (No response.)
3
                 THE COURT: All right. Then it's admitted.
4
       party going to wish to cross-examine Mr. Brose?
5
            (No response.)
6
                 THE COURT: All right. Anyone have -- object to the
7
       Declaration of Mr. Singh found at Docket No. 98?
8
            (No response.)
9
                 THE COURT: All right. It's admitted.
10
                 Anyone wish to cross examine Mr. Singh?
11
            (No response.)
12
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Then with that,
13
       are we -- can we go to Ms. Berkovich? Ms. Berkovich, my
14
       apologies.
15
                 MR. SCHROCK: Yes, Your Honor.
16
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
17
                 Ms. Berkovich, whenever you're ready.
18
                 MS. BERKOVICH: Good morning, Your Honor, can you
19
       hear me?
20
                 THE COURT: Loud and clear. Thank you.
21
                 MS. BERKOVICH: Okay. This is Ronit Berkovich from
22
       Weil Gotshal & Manges, for the Debtors. Your Honor, the next
23
       item on the Agenda is Docket No. 38, the Debtor's motion for
24
       approval of DIP financing and use of cash collateral.
25
                 We separately, last night, filed this budget, Docket
```

No. 97, the DIP credit agreement at Docket No. 96, and just before the hearing, at Docket No. 108, we filed the revised DIP Order and a redlined of that DIP Order against the one that was included with our motion.

For evidentiary support of the DIP motion, we filed a Declaration of John Singh at Docket No. 36. This was just admitted into evidence. And Your Honor, Mr. Singh, as Mr. Schrock said, is in the virtual courtroom today and available for cross-examination if needed.

We also, for evidentiary support, relying on the Brose Declaration which was also admitted. So I would like to start this morning by giving Your Honor a brief overview of the DIP, and a brief summary of the Debtor's pre-petition DIP marketing process.

Your Honor, the Debtors and the ad hoc group of secured noteholders have been working around the clock to finalize the terms of the RSA and the DIP. And as the documents that we filed in the last 24 hours demonstrate, we successfully reached a deal.

Everything is final. There's a few open items in the credit agreements, but those can be resolved this morning. In a nutshell, Your Honor, Debtors seek authority between (indiscernible) finding Debtor-in-Possession financing, and either gets principal amounts of new money, not to exceed 75 million (indiscernible) conditions of the DIP credit

agreement attached to the DIP motion, and the proposed DIP Order.

At the interim hearing today, we're only seeking authority to borrow up to 37.5 million of that 75 million. I think it's important to note that of the 75 million, only approximately 57 million is fully committed at this time.

That number's from the ad hoc group. However, the DIP is going to be fully self-syndicated to other pre-petition secured noteholders, and our hope is to have the full 75 million by the time of the final hearing.

Note there is also a (indiscernible) that will not go into effect until the final hearing. We actually negotiated very hard to push off all controversial terms in the DIP Order until the Final Order.

And from the comments that we've heard this morning, I think that we're generally successful. Just for the Record, we very much welcome (indiscernible) Riley or anyone else coming in to take out this DIP with a better DIP prior to the Final Order. It's been negotiated very broad, (indiscernible) carve out in the RSA to allow us to talk to other parties about DIP, or a reduction transaction broadly speaking, on better terms than we've been able to negotiate with our prepetition DIP or noteholders.

And we do have unencumbered assets available for that financing, but of course, it's (indiscernible) come in,

we have to take out different issues today.

We're also seeking to use the pre-petition third-party cash collateral and provide them adequate protection as set forth in the proposed Order.

Your Honor, unless Your Honor has any questions about that, I'll move into some of the key terms of the DIP.

THE COURT: So I don't --

MS. BERKOVICH: Our belief --

THE COURT: My apologies. No, I don't have any -- I don't have any questions. I do have a couple of comments, but I'm happy to wait until you finish going through the terms.

MS. BERKOVICH: Okay. I think that based on those (indiscernible) of an Order, so I'll just very high level touch on some of the (indiscernible) or the key terms. The borrowers will be pursuant to an approved budget with variances, very standard.

The maturity of this DIP is six months, and was negotiate and be able to extend the DIP by an additional three months by paying a two percent fee. Interest rate on the DIP is 10 percent.

And very important, one major concession we got is to be able to pay that interest in kind, which eliminates the cash burden on the Debtor during the case.

Talking about the fees for a moment. There are three categories of fees. These are also all paid in kind.

First, there's the new money loan commitment payment. This is effectively an up (indiscernible) of two percent.

Further on the dates the new money loans are drawn by the borrower. So (indiscernible) over, 37.5 million.

There is a backstop payment fee that we're seeking approval of. I did mention the DIP is going to be syndicated to all convertible noteholders. But the members of the Ad Hoc Group were already committed 57 million are given a backstop fee for committing (indiscernible) amount. We initially negotiated that fee to be \$2 million for the whole \$75 million commitment.

As we noted in the DIP motion, which we filed and never (indiscernible) economic issues, which (indiscernible) those economic issues were, we were successful in getting the noteholders to agree that is could be (indiscernible) down to the lower commitment amount.

So (indiscernible) 1.6 mil is for the backstop fee. And then these group will also be paid in kind.

Then there's the termination fee. It gets a little complicated but at the time the Debtors payoff of the DIP facility in these circumstances, the Debtors will move to pay 115 percent of all outstanding new money loans with cash, in addition to other obligations outstanding.

We knew at the time we filed the DIP motion that there was still some back and forth as to whether this

15 percent termination fee would apply (indiscernible) with interest, or pay fees on the outstanding loan amounts.

That industry should be (indiscernible), it will because it was -- to provide an example, in order to pay off the \$37.5 million DIP during the interim period, the Debtors would have to pay -- we would have to pay off that 37.5 million, plus the two percent up-front fee, plus the (indiscernible) backstop fee, plus (indiscernible) interest, and an additional 15 percent of all those combined.

So just (indiscernible) calculation, that's about four weeks to pay off the \$37.5 million DIP. The Debtors would need to pay almost \$9 million more, or \$46.25 million.

There are additional termination fees for the roll up loans. And depending on how the DIP is paid off at the exit, but those are really not applicable in the interim period, so I won't get into those now.

And as set forth in Mr. Singh's Declaration, these are the best we could negotiate, and we believe they are reasonable under the circumstances as a package deal, and (indiscernible) benefits the Debtors are getting from the DIP financing.

Okay. So we talked briefly, and Mr. Schrock talked about the milestones. These are set forth in the DIP. It's actually (indiscernible) nimble, but not super tight. It gives us the time to (indiscernible) we need to do.

I just (indiscernible) our equipment lenders, and maybe somebody else will come along at some point, if the price of bitcoin goes up. So they're comfortable with these milestones, 75 (indiscernible) file a plan.

But there's an additional 75 million, 150 days for the Court to enter the confirmation Order. And that, they might automatically extend it, extend the maturity date that they have the right to do.

And the effective date milestone is 155 (indiscernible).

The next I was going to turn to the discussion of the collateral and priority and (indiscernible), unless Your Honor has any questions about what I've already talked about?

THE COURT: No, I'm with you so far.

MS. BERKOVICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

So I did want to talk about the collateral for a minute. This is not a typical situation where the primary pre-petition unsecured creditor has a blanket lien on all assets and are only a secured party.

We've already heard from some of our equipment lenders this morning, and last night, we heard from one of our parties with a mechanic's lien. Importantly, the equipment lenders have liens on equipment that's not part of the convertible noteholder collateral package.

And we have a lot of real estate that was not

encumbered by the convertible noteholders lien. At this point, over \$65 million in mechanic's liens have been filed against that real estate for unpaid construction amounts.

And here's how this all shapes out in the DIP Order. So the DIP lenders are getting a first priority lien on substantially all of the unencumbered property. The DIP lenders are keeping a lien junior to what we call permitted prior senior liens and this is a concept that's changed a little bit in the DIP Order from the version that we had on file yesterday, from what we filed this morning. And so when I get a chance to walk through the DIP Order, I will point out where this is.

But the permitted prior (indiscernible) definition is from the credit agreement. And I'll read it for the Record. It's liens on the assets of property financed by the debt or other obligations set forth in Schedule 10.2.2, to the extent such liens and security interest were valid, protected and non-avoidable as of the petition date," end quote.

So the Schedule that we prepared as part of the credit agreement with equipment and non-equipment secured loans and mechanic's liens that the Debtors have identified. It does not list the equipment (indiscernible).

It also will contain language that would include mechanic's liens that are properly perfected after the petition date, pursuant to Section 536(b). So it goes back to

the DIP lenders for (indiscernible).

The DIP lenders are priming, and other existing liens including the convertible noteholders pre-petition liens. All of those categories are what we call DIP collateral, and the DIP lenders are also getting a superpriority admin claim.

Now to move onto the noteholders. As adequate protection for the diminution in value of their collateral, pre-petition secured noteholders are getting what placement means in the DIP collateral, junior to DIP liens.

And they're also getting junior superpriority admin claims.

So I will spend a minute on the equipment lenders and lessors. They are an important (indiscernible), and we have been talking about it for months.

This is not the first that we're seeking (indiscernible) from them. They are many of them, the debt exceeds \$300 million. 285 million of that approximately is the debt from the mining equipment, you know, the miners that actually produce the bitcoin.

We did in this Order provide, you know, gratuitously from the adequate protection for them, but this Order was never intended to be a conclusive determination, but they're adequately protected. There's no request for termination in that Order.

We understand from talking to their counsel that what we put in there, which I'll get to, may not be sufficient but it is a starting point.

They have the right under the Code to ask for adequate protection and we are committed to speaking to them to try to dissolved their concerns about adequate protection, as well as we can (indiscernible) each of them in the (indiscernible) of restructuring.

Your Honor early properly touched on some of the issues in the process that might be required for that. In the first instance, we will try to work out the valuation issues consensually, but we've heard loud and clear that Your Honor is ready to go if we need the Court's assistance with any of this and the Court is very familiar with the issues involved.

As Mr. Ferris, the attorney for BlockFi, represented, some of the equipment lenders, not all of them, have organized as a group with some of their concerns, which is coming across that they are concerned over adequate protection in the Order. That's very helpful to us. It's not your typical group because they all have different agreements and they have different collateral, they have different values, some are better machines than others, some are more under-secured than others. They have individual issues, but they also have issues that overlap or they're similar.

And so what we do provide in the Order -- this is

even prior to the negotiation with them -- we do give them adequate protection claim for any diminution in value of their equipment and adequate protection replacement liens that are, with respect to their existing collateral, senior to all other liens including DIP liens and liens of the prepetition secured noteholders.

And then with respect to the noteholder prepetition collateral, the equipment lender adequate protection liens are junior (indiscernible) and these are junior to DIP liens, but pari passu with the noteholder adequate protection liens on assets that are currently unencumbered. And all of this is subject to those lenders having valid and properly perfectly liens.

We'll go through the language in the Order in a minute and I'm sure if I didn't get it exactly right,

Mr. Gilad will come in and (indiscernible) that, but

everything's, of course, just language in the Order.

There's also a standard carve-out for professional fees.

So I will pause there because this is a little more complex than normal and I don't know if this is the issue that the Court had questions on.

THE COURT: So let me -- now is a great breaking point.

So with respect to -- number one, I appreciate the

redline. When I was listening to the opening presentation, I had the opportunity to review the redline that is attached to 108. I don't have any questions. If you want to highlight a certain provision for me, I'm happy to go there, but I've also had the opportunity to look at and I'm relatively comfortable with what's there and more focused on the changes that were made. None of the changes caused me any heartburn at all.

I do have just a couple of issues that I want to highlight and maybe this will help others, maybe it won't. With respect to the avoidance action issue on the liens that are granted, conceptually I don't have a problem with it. I do generally ask that there be a last-look provision added with respect to avoidance proceeds and just given the way that this is, I don't see any harm and it takes a strategic concern out of play for me.

So I would ask that as you work toward a final because I know that this isn't coming today is that you look at other Orders that the other parties talk about some last-look language for avoidance proceeds.

With respect to the roll up, again I got what's being done. I do really, really like the dollar-for-dollar creep because it protects interests in case something we all don't anticipate occurring, that it just protects everybody's rights and so actually it stops a lot of the jockeying or at least it's been my experience. So I would ask that as you

look at that roll up is that you think about the dollar-for-dollar creep.

And perhaps that's just -- maybe I should explain that because now that I'm listening to myself, that sounds a little weird but it just simply, as advances are made, that the roll up creeps up with the total advances that have been made so I just ask that you think about that.

With respect to the exercising of remedies, you covered all of my concerns. I appreciate your pulling that from somewhere else because again I think that that's just the right balance.

I think other than that, again I -- this is expensive money. I don't think anybody's to say that this is just a bargain. It's expensive money. Lending into this type of situation is going to be expensive because I don't know how you assess the risk. And given the PIC feature, I mean, PIC loans are always expensive and I got that issue too. It's just part of the risk assessment. So I understand it.

Obviously if Ms. Hardy comes up with something that's better, faster, stronger, cheaper, we're all going to applaud her and have another conversation, but I got it. It's not out of the range of what I expected to see.

I think those are my general comments with respect -- again this is just -- it's an interim request. I don't know if there are other comments or arguments the

parties want to make with respect to the interim with the understanding that again however you all choose to resolve these issues with respect to adequate protection of valuation or otherwise, I stand ready to go. But if there are other arguments that folks want to make with respect to the revised proposed Order that can be found at Docket 108, I'm happy to hear them and engage.

Mr. Ferris, you want to go first?

MR. FERRIS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. Again for the Record, Matt Ferris, Haynes and Boone, on behalf of BlockFi.

Your Honor, I appreciate Ms. Berkovich's comments. Those are helpful. And those -- they're consistent with our understanding of the way the lien priorities are supposed to look and consistent with the Motion and the Declaration in support of the DIP.

Unfortunately, we don't find the Order to be quite as clear on that. And this permitted prior lien concept, that's a fairly recent concept that's been added and that's not to say that it is not a workable concept, but it references a schedule that we haven't seen yet and so we fully expect that the schedule will be consistent with what's been represented. We just haven't seen it.

And I also have -- my personal preference,

Your Honor, is rather than having references to documents that

are not necessarily attached to the Order is to just have the Order reflect what's happening, which is that, as we understand it, there is no priming of the equipment miner liens, that any liens that are being granted in connection with the DIP are going to be junior to the valid properly perfected prepetition equivalent of liens as well as adequate protection liens on that that are replacement liens on that same collateral.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. FERRIS: The one issue -- I'm sorry, excuse me, Your Honor, go ahead.

THE COURT: No, my fault. What I was going to suggest is, Ms. Berkovich, if you haven't already done so, if you could have somebody send that schedule and maybe even perhaps a highlighted version over to Mr. Ferris? We've got a number of other things to talk about and perhaps maybe someone else on the Weil team and, Mr. Ferris, someone else at your shop who's involved in this could perhaps talk offline, see if we have an issue or not and then we can revisit toward the end or we can say, "Well, we're going to make -- we're going to add this language or delete that language and we're good for purposes of the interim."

Could I ask you folks to do that? No need to stake out a position. Let's just get -- let's get to it and see if we have a problem or not. Can we do that?

1 MR. FERRIS: That works for us. 2 MS. BERKOVICH: Yes, sir. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 4 MS. BERKOVICH: And we send over to Mr. Ferris and 5 the other equipment lenders we've been talking about. 6 represent that his client is on there and then muted. And I 7 understand why he wants to (indiscernible) himself. 8 THE COURT: Of course. 9 MS. BERKOVICH: Any equipment lender that we know 10 about we've put on that schedule. We worked on that 11 (indiscernible) resolved any issues connected with the Order. 12 THE COURT: I got it. If I could do this: 13 Mr. Ferris, do you want this to come to you or is there 14 someone else who is off camera that is as engaged as you are 15 in this issue? 16 MR. FERRIS: Yeah. My partner, Arsalan Muhammad, is 17 participating in the hearing as well and he's been on the 18 email traffic so if they can just send it to him, that'd be 19 great. 20 THE COURT: Fair enough. I just didn't want to miss 21 someone because we didn't mention them, so that's -- I know 22 Mr. Muhammad well and he will be on this just as quickly as he 23 gets it so terrific. 24 And, Mr. Ferris, I interrupted you. I didn't mean 25 to do that. I just wanted to deal with that issue.

What was your other concern?

MR. FERRIS: Your Honor, that was the overarching concern. Again I'm not going to belabor the point on adequate protection. We will work with the Debtors on that and if we need to come back, we will.

I will say that we have not been included in some of the typical secured lender protection so we will continue to work on that in connection with a final. And as others have done, we just reserve all rights with respect to issues that are set for the final hearing including the roll up as -- to the extent not (indiscernible) as a potential -- as a (indiscernible) deficiency claim.

THE COURT: I got it. I haven't been involved in those discussions either so we'll just work through those issues together if, as and when they are -- they remain live, okay?

MR. FERRIS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Let me ask: Anyone else?

MR. GILAD: Your Honor, this is Erez Gilad with Paul

Hastings. Can I be heard?

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. GILAD: Good morning, Your Honor. Erez Gilad for the Record, Paul Hastings, counsel to the DIP lenders and the Convertible Noteholder Ad Hoc Group.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. GILAD: So my comments address both substance and process, but let me address Your Honor's latest comments first. In terms of process, it is fair to say that this was an (indiscernible) process that occurred over the last 24-48 hours and it was rolling so there is a pending version of the DIP Credit Agreement and the same schedule that is being edited as we speak.

And we can confirm, as Ms. Berkovich already did, that Mr. Ferris' client is on this payment schedule so we plan -- we and the Debtors plan to get that over to him right away. We still think that times out. I think there are some tweaks on our side we want to incorporate and then absolutely we're confident that the materials we send over will (indiscernible) his concerns. And then if they don't, we'll do our best to address his comments and we can go from there.

And in terms of other equipment financing lenders, we hope that we solve this issue not just for Mr. Ferris, but for all the other counsel that reached out. We told everyone that we would and we hereby represent that the DIP liens do not prime the mechanic liens and they do not prime liens and the machines and equipment that secure the equipment financing to the extent they're validly perfected as of the petition date.

If I may, there are some other comments I'd like to make in terms of some of the statements made in respect to the

DIP and the final hearing, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. GILAD: One other aspect about the DIP roll up that I think Your Honor will find to be fascinating is the roll up, if and when implemented, does not throw up any interest so a zero percent interest roll up so that, I think, is maybe the first of its kind.

Number two, one clarification. An earlier iteration of the DIP had a creeping roll up concept to it, but in light of the shift and evolution of the negotiations, the roll up will fully occur upon --

THE COURT: To their lien.

MR. GILAD: -- if and when the final Order is entered, but bear in mind however that the amount of the roll up is far below the traditional two-to-one ratio that the Court typically sees. So I think that between the economic terms of the roll up, the need for the financing, which is essentially a lifeline for the company, we do hope that it will meet with the Court's approval, but again that's all rights reserved at the final hearing.

THE COURT: Wait.

MR. GILAD: In terms of --

THE COURT: Can in interrupt you for just a second? You're just telling me that the creep has no effect because you're going to fully draw at a final hearing.

MR. GILAD: I believe that it may not be fully drawn at the final hearing.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GILAD: There may be interim -- there may borrowings that occur from and after the final, but the full committed amount will be rolled up.

THE COURT: I got it. I just misunderstood what you said. I got it. And I wasn't saying that's a requirement. I just said I like it. It's easier -- it's an accretive thing for me and there are other issues that I'm willing to just simply bite my tongue on as part of an overall deal and that tends to be one that is easy to accomplish when folks know that I really do like the one-for-one creep. That's all.

MR. GILAD: Thank you, Your Honor. The last comment I'll make and because a lot has been made about this in terms of purported unencumbered value.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. GILAD: Yes, there is unencumbered value in the case, but it's also important to put these into perspective and proper context and not overstate the extent of that unencumbered value.

I guess the best practical way to understand the concept is that this is a chapter 11 filing that has been very well previewed. It's not advertised for many weeks prior to the actual filing date and I think it's fair to say that in

looking at the demonstrative exhibits prepared for the First Day Hearing, which is very helpful, I think nearly all members of the capital structure are here in front of you at the table and in court.

The Debtors, as far as we are aware, extensively marketed the DIP and were in active dialog with many if not all of the people that are currently before you in the court. And here we are, this is only committed financing that is available to the Debtors. So I think that that should speak to the overall concept as to the role if any that the notion that there's unencumbered value here would play into future misgivings if any about this DIP financing.

So I'll leave it at that other than to say we do appreciate the efforts of the Debtors and their professionals. It's been a very active process. I'd like to say that this was more than arm's length. It was arm wrestling. Ms. Berkovich was very successful in the negotiations. So I'll leave it at that and thank the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

Anyone else? Mr. Lohan?

MR. LOHAN: Your Honor, Brian Lohan, on behalf of Barings again. I've been wanting to do this at the risk of opening the floodgates because we tried to streamline everything through Mr. Ferris, but if -- it would be really helpful if Ms. Berkovich or Mr. Gilad could confirm to Barings

who will also be on that schedule 10.2 as well.

THE COURT: So let's do this because I don't want to open that floodgate because every single person will do that.

I assume that you're on the circulation list for the revised agreement on the schedule.

MS. BERKOVICH: Yes.

MR. LOHAN: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't we -- Mr. Lohan, if you're not, then we need to ask why not, but let's get the schedule so that I don't get every single person saying, "Well, what about me," and "What about me?" If it turns out that there's a problem, I will sit here as long as we need to and I will be available to resolve this issue, but let's see the document and let's just save the headache if we could.

MR. LOHAN: Of course, Your Honor.

MS. BERKOVICH: Yeah. We'll send it out when we (indiscernible) with Mr. Lohan, Mr. Ferris and all the (indiscernible) lenders that we spoke to last night. If anyone else would like to see the schedule, please send me an email. My email address is on the pleadings and I will send you the schedule as well.

THE COURT: Terrific. Thank you. All right.

Anyone else?

MR. RUFF: Good afternoon -- or good morning still, Your Honor. Jayson Ruff for the US Trustee's Office.

Can you hear me okay?

THE COURT: I'm clear. Thank you. And good morning.

MR. RUFF: Okay, great. Your Honor, I only rise just to raise the one outstanding issue that we have and our purpose, our role really is more to, in these interim proceedings, just try to preserve people's rights, due process rights and see that the status quo is achieved as much as possible.

And the only open issue -- first of all, I just want to extend my thanks to the Debtors and probably the lender group in the background for their willingness to work through what's a very compressed time frame. The only issue that we still had, Your Honor, was with respect to the time amount -- the time allowed for a trustee whether it's a chapter 7 or chapter 11 trustee.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. RUFF: We would originally propose that there be a 10-day time frame. We had asked for 60 days. The Debtors - - and I guess with an agreement -- the lender group came back at 30 days. We still believe that's a little bit too compressed of a time frame to allow for a trustee to actually perform their duty. And so we proposed a 45-day period as a compromise so that's the only issue that we have and I just wanted to flag that for Your Honor.

THE COURT: No, Mr. Ruff, I appreciate it very much. I think that 30 days is just fine. Thank you.

Anyone else?

MR. TWOMEY: Yes, Judge Jones, one final request.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. TWOMEY: Again Dennis Twomey, on behalf of NYDIG. I think 10(b) -- Section 10(b) of the DIP Order provides that the Debtors will provide reportings to the secured parties and to the prepetition agents of the Ad Hoc Group. We would ask that those same materials be shared with -- I'm guessing all of the equipment lenders would like them, but I'll certainly -- on behalf of NYDIG, if we could also get those materials shared with us, we would appreciate that.

THE COURT: Unless there's some confidential business reason not to do this.

Ms. Berkovich, if we appoint Mr. Ferris as the beginning of the distribution list, would you have any problem adding Mr. Ferris?

MS. BERKOVICH: So I believe what's being asked for now is the reporting that the DIP lenders get under the DIP loan and shortly before this hearing, we were (indiscernible) separate from Mr. Ferris' group asked for that reporting. We told him that we just need to look at what it is and think about whether there's any confidentiality issues or any other reason, competitive issues that we would not want to give the

same level of reporting the DIP lender gets to our equipment lenders. They're not entitled to reporting at this time.

We will work out an adequate protection package with them and some of that might include reporting and we may have no problem giving him reporting that he's asking for. I just cannot say that at this time. Perhaps someone --

THE COURT: Fair enough. So let me deal with this. So, one, I do want to be concerned because of the comments earlier that one or more equipment lenders may be purchasers. They may have other roles in the case and I'm sensitive to that. I'm also sensitive to competitive issues. Let's do this -- and again I -- this is not an adequate protection issue with me so much as it is just a transparency of the process issue.

So, Mr. Twomey, what I'm going to ask is that you engage on what it is you're looking for because again I'm still learning as well and I certainly am not trying to tip the scale in any direction, but I do like transparency over less transparency and so I'm going to ask you to have that conversation.

If it turns out that there is a problem, I am perfectly happy to take that issue up on an emergency basis in and of itself, but I do think it's probably worth -- I mean, now that I've said what I've said, it's probably worth having a conversation just to see what information it is that you're

really interested in.

And also again I want the professionals to all look at this because I do not want something that, in my effort to have transparency, all of a sudden change competitive advantage or the economics of anything to the Estate's detriment. So if I could ask you to have that with a promise that if you can't find common ground or there's something you really believe you need, I will take that up on an emergency basis as soon as you ask, okay?

MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. BERKOVICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. TWOMEY: I appreciate it and I'm confident we'll be able to work something out.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anything else?

MS. BERKOVICH: Your Honor, I did want to just clarify one point in my describing the equipment liens earlier. The equipment lenders have a lien in about half of the company's miners. The company also has tens of thousands of miners that are not subject to the liens of the equipment lenders that are part of the collateral that was granted to the featured noteholders. So I just want to make sure that there's no confusion in the Record on that point.

THE COURT: I am absolutely certain there's all sorts of confusion and we'll just work our way through that.

I do want the document to get circulated so we can all not be

guessing and trying to be protective and we can actually say, "This works" or "It doesn't work," and we'll just -- we're just going to have to deal with that. But I got the point. We'll figure out a way to address all this. But I do want everybody to see the same document so we all know what we're working from.

Let me ask -- last opportunity. Anyone want to raise an issue, have an objection?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right. Then again with the understanding that we will address many of these issues again at a final, based upon the Record that I've got before me both regarding the lack of alternatives, the nature of the business, the current cash position, I am going to find that the requested relief is appropriate. It meets the relevant provisions of the Bankruptcy Code.

From a practical perspective, we have to be able to get from point A to point B. It's expensive money, but it's the only game in town and it is money that solves a lot of short-term issues.

So I am going to find that the Debtor has properly exercised its business judgment. And again I think those critical issues that needed to be dealt with on an interim, they have been. And again we're going to revisit some of this issues on a final, but I'm concern that as best we can -- and

it's not always possible to preserve the status quo and it shouldn't be because there is an extension of the value that is sorely needed that is being injected.

I'm going to approve the interim request as we have modified with various statements in the Record this morning with again the revisions set forth in what is Docket No. 108. I will approve the DIP on an interim basis.

Ms. Berkovich, as you -- as we work through -- and if we need to come back and deal with specific language on a propose Order, we can. But this is subject to the submission of a revised form of Order that everyone who has an interest or has expressed an interest and seen it has had the opportunity to look at it.

The one thing I need to give you is your next hearing date. Did you have thoughts in mind?

MS. BERKOVICH: Your Honor, I'll just say one thing. We should have coordinated on this before but with everything going on we did not. I do know that the clients would like the hearing to be before January 21st in Order to get the financing done by then so sometime in that week. I will turn it over to Mr. Schrock to try to figure that out with you.

THE COURT: Okay. The 19th or 20th seems to me to give everybody maximum time and still meet the requirement that you've expressed by your client.

Do you have a preference, Mr. Schrock,

```
1
       Ms. Berkovich, anyone else?
2
                 MR. SCHROCK: The 19th sounds good, Your Honor.
3
                 THE COURT: The 19th? What about -- just given
4
       everything else I've got that day, what about 3:30 Central
5
       time? Would that work for everyone? I know it's a little
6
       late in the day for our East Coast colleagues but that's the
7
       best for me.
8
                 MR. SCHROCK: Okay.
9
                 THE COURT: Does that work? Okay.
10
                 MR. GILAD: If I may, Your Honor? This is
11
       Erez Gilad from Paul Hastings. I'm out of the country that
12
       week.
13
                 THE COURT: Are you able --
14
                 MR. GILAD: Is it possible to -- I don't know if the
15
       Debtors are available on Monday, the 23rd, or if the Court's
16
       available.
17
                 MS. BERKOVICH: That might be a holiday. If that
       will give -- if that's okay from a --
18
19
                 THE COURT: Yeah, the holiday is the 16th.
20
                 MS. BERKOVICH: Okay.
21
                 MR. SCHROCK: Yeah, that's the weekend. That's okay
22
       for me, Ronit, if it's okay for you.
23
                 MS. BERKOVICH: I think (indiscernible) 23rd works
24
       for the company. It probably does. Let me just confirm
25
       offline and then we'll confirm the hearing date shortly.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: All right. So let me do this because I
       have a trial that starts that day, but I will just send
3
       everybody to lunch so what I would be offering would be noon
4
       on the 23rd.
5
                 MR. SCHROCK: Why don't we pencil that in,
6
       Your Honor?
7
                 THE COURT: Okay.
8
                 MR. SCHROCK: And we'll let you know if there are
9
       any issues, but that sounds fine.
10
                 THE COURT: All right. Anyone have a problem with
11
       noon on the 23rd?
12
            (No verbal response.)
13
                 THE COURT: Okay. With objections due -- since the
14
       16th is a holiday, objections due by close of business on the
15
       17th?
16
                 MR. SCHROCK: Uh-huh.
17
                 THE COURT: Okay.
18
                 MR. SCHROCK: That's good, Your Honor. And I heard
19
       from the company since you've been speaking. That's a
20
       confirmed time. Thank you.
21
                 THE COURT: All right. Terrific. And again subject
22
       to the submission of a revised proposed Order,
23
       Ms. Berkovich, if you would simply just have somebody on your
       team coordinate with Mr. Alonzo, I will -- and again the
24
25
       redline is always much appreciated, just makes my life a whole
```

```
1
       lot easier.
                 MS. BERKOVICH: Understood and will do,
3
       Your Honor. Thank you very much.
4
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
5
                 MR. SCHROCK: Thank you, Your Honor.
6
                 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you.
7
                 What's next?
8
                 MR. SCHROCK: Ronit, do you want to turn it over to
9
       (indiscernible)?
10
                 MS. BERKOVICH: Next on the Agenda is the Motion to
11
       approve the payment to critical vendors. My colleague,
12
       Destiny Reyes, will be handling that.
13
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Let's see,
14
       Ms. Reyes -- Ms. Reyes, is fancy. There we go. All right.
15
       Ms. Reyes, good morning.
16
                 MS. REYES: Good morning, Your Honor.
17
                 Destiny Reyes of Weil Gotshal and Manges, on behalf
18
       of the Debtors.
19
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Whenever you're
20
       ready.
21
                 MS. REYES: Your Honor -- thank you. Your Honor,
22
       the next item on the Agenda is Item No. 4, the Debtor's
23
       critical vendor Motion, filed at Docket No. 4. The Debtors
24
       seek interim authority to pay prepetition claims of certain
25
       vendors including those whose goods and services are critical
```

```
1
       to the Debtor's operation and lien vendors that may be
       entitled to liens against the Debtors or their customers'
3
       assets.
4
                 We settled any concerns of the United States Trustee
5
       prior to this hearing.
                 The Debtors are seeking authority to pay $300,000 in
6
7
       the interim on critical vendor claims and an additional $300
8
       on lien claims.
9
                 MALE SPEAKER: 300,000.
10
                 MS. REYES: 300,000, yes.
11
                 THE COURT: Big difference.
12
            (Laughter.)
13
                 MS. REYES: Sorry. Thank you.
14
                 THE COURT: No, because my --
15
                 MS. REYES: Further, the Debtors --
                 THE COURT: My salary is $300. Yours is probably
16
17
       closer to 300,000.
18
                 MS. REYES: 300,000 for each critical vendor and
19
       liens.
              Sorry about that.
20
                 THE COURT: Quite all right.
21
                 MS. REYES: Further, the Debtors seek authority to
22
       enter into trade agreements substantially in the form of
23
       Exhibit C of the Motion in Order to solidify favorable trade
       terms for the Debtors. The Debtors also seek limited
24
25
       authority to pay vendor claims in the event that no agreement
```

can be executed or where one is unnecessary or prohibited.

The uninterrupted continuation of the Debtor's business depends upon the continued support of those vendor claimants and we're going to pay the vendors on the terms and conditions set forth in the interim Order, would likely create a crisis in confidence among such vendors and consequently the hosting customers, which would significantly harm the Debtor's business to the detriment of all the stakeholders. I'm happy to answer any questions Your Honor may have.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Ruff, this seems pretty straightforward to me and actually is a modest request.

Any concerns?

MR. RUFF: No concerns and they did preview it with us, Your Honor, so we're -- no opposition to this.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else wish to address the request?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right. Again I think the request is modest. I think that it is undeniable that being able to address transition issues aids in increasing or maximizing the value of the Estate and the ongoing value of the business. I don't have any concerns of the request.

I'll find that under the circumstances, due process has been served and a notice is sufficient.

```
1
                 Let me ask: Ms. Reyes, it seems to me we've got a
       blank that we need to fill in. Were you thinking of trying to
3
       have this on the 23rd as well or did you have another time in
4
       mind?
5
                 MS. REYES: The 23rd works for us, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: All right. So let me do this.
6
7
            (Pause in the proceedings.)
8
                 THE COURT: So January the 23rd at 12:00 o'clock
9
       noon.
10
                 And objection deadline we said the 17th, didn't we?
11
                 MALE SPEAKER: Uh-huh.
12
                 MS. REYES: Yes.
13
                 THE COURT: All right. And we didn't pick a time
14
       for objections, but it just seems to me if we just said
15
       4:00 o'clock Central, does that make sense?
                 MALE SPEAKER: That's good.
16
17
                 MS. REYES: Yes.
18
                 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Reyes, I have
19
       interlineated those blanks on the proposed Order. I'm happy
20
       to show it to you if you don't trust me, but I'm pretty
21
       confident I got that part right.
22
                 MS. REYES: We trust you. I do want to flag one
23
       thing for Your Honor. On paragraph 4 of the Order, there is a
24
       date of December 31st but we want to change that to
25
       January 31st, if there's no objection from Mr. Ruff, as
```

```
1
       agreed.
2
                 THE COURT: Okay. So you want to --
3
                 MR. RUFF: No opposition to that, Your Honor.
4
                 THE COURT: All right. So I'm interlineate -- or
5
       I'm going to replace December 31, 2022 with January 31st, 2023
6
       in paragraph 4, correct, Ms. Reyes?
7
                 MS. REYES: Thank you.
                 THE COURT: Okay.
8
9
                 MS. REYES:
                            Yes.
10
                 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
11
            (No verbal response.)
12
                 THE COURT: All right. That Order has been signed
13
       and it is off to docketing.
14
                 Ms. Reyes, what's next?
15
                 MS. REYES:
                             Thank you, Your Honor. The next item on
16
       the Agenda is No. 5, the Debtor's insurance Motion filed at
17
       Docket No. 13. We previewed the proposed interim and final
18
       Orders with the US Trustee here as well, as well as the Ad Hoc
19
       Group and they incorporated minor edits accordingly.
20
                 In this Motion, we're seeking authority to continue
21
       the insurance program and to pay related prepetition
22
       obligations related thereto as well as grant limited relief
23
       from the automatic stay to permit workers compensation claims
24
       to proceed in the ordinary course.
25
                 Your Honor, like any other company, the Debtors need
```

to maintain a wide variety of insurance programs in order to conduct their business and remain good corporate citizens.

Accordingly, pursuant to this Motion, the Debtors are seeking authority to maintain their various insurance programs and (indiscernible) including the payment of broker fees in the ordinary course of business.

In this interim period, we're requesting authority to continue these insurance programs and to pay or otherwise satisfy any insurance obligations in the ordinary course and pay for prepetition amounts of \$330,000 in property insurance obligations and \$5,000 in workers compensation program obligations. Again I'm happy to answer any questions Your Honor may have.

THE COURT: So let me ask you: what's the difference between the interim request and the final request? Because doesn't this work a hardship on the company? Because everyone's going to look at an interim Order and say, "Well, this really doesn't help because it's going to get revisited." I mean, we all want the Debtor to be adequately insured. I mean, everybody wants that. But what was the difference?

MS. REYES: Right. So the difference is really due process and providing notice to those parties that might have any objections in the interim, but providing that adequate assurance and also having this be final would be most welcome for us, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I just -- this just seems to me to be one of the stabilization issues so that everyone can know that the Debtor is a commercial actor adequately insured with the ability -- with no changes waiting to happen. I just think that it maximizes corporate opportunity.

Let me ask it this way: is there any objection to my granting the insurance Motion on a final basis?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right. With that, again for those reasons that I've expressed -- and I very much appreciate the due process concerns. This is one of those things that I think the primary concern of the US Trustee and those folks who will deal with the Debtor on an ongoing basis and I think this is just a level of competence that is needed in order to maximize the Debtor's chances going forward.

So I am going to grant the Motion. I had a chance to read it. And I think the due process has been satisfied, the notice is sufficient. Given the requested relief and the fact that we've got an active US Trustee present, I'm going to grant the Motion on a final basis. I'm going to use the proposed form of Order that's found at 13-2.

Ms. Reyes, can you just verify that I've got that right?

MS. REYES: Yes, Your Honor, I believe so.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. That Order has

```
1
       been signed and it is on its way to docketing.
2
                 What's next?
3
                 MS. REYES: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll pass the
4
       podium to my colleague, Alex Kane.
5
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Can I do one
6
       thing? I meant to say this. I just found my note. With
7
       respect to the DIP Order and the use of cash collateral, there
8
       is a standard -- I didn't see it. There's a standard
9
       paragraph that the ad valorem taxing authorities always want
10
       and the only thing is since I didn't see it, I just wanted to
11
       remind the Debtor of it. It avoids a fight. You know it's
12
       coming when somebody pays attention to it. If it's already
13
       there and I missed it, my apologies. That was just a note
14
       that I made myself and I'm sorry for not catching it first
15
       time.
16
                 And, Ms. Reyes, I am -- sorry, who did you say you
17
       were passing the lectern to?
18
                 MS. REYES: Alex Kane.
19
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
20
                 Mr. Kane [sic]?
21
                 MS. REYES: Thank you.
22
                 THE COURT:
                             Thank you.
23
                 MS. KANE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alex Kane of
24
       Weil Gotshal and Manges, on behalf of the Debtors.
25
                 THE COURT: Ms. Kane, my --
```

MS. KANE: Your Honor, the next item on -THE COURT: I was just going to apologize for calling you "Mister" Kane.

Ms. Kane, please proceed.

MS. KANE: It happens more than you think.

Your Honor, the next item on the Agenda is the Debtor's taxes Motion, Docket No. 3. By this Motion, the Debtors are seeking authority to pay taxes and fees that arose prior to the petition date and any (indiscernible) amounts that may come due in the ordinary course. The Debtors estimate that approximately 8.9 million in taxes and fees relating to the period prior to the petition date will become due with approximately 2.95 million coming due within the 30 days following the petition date.

The table on page 4 of Docket No. 3, you'll see a breakdown of the categories and the amounts the Debtors are seeking to pay. The Debtors discussed this Motion with the US Trustee and we incorporated their comments and we believe there are no outstanding objections or issues.

Unless Your Honor has any questions around this Motion, the Debtors request that the Court enter the Order approving the Motion.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And it is the Order that was attached to the Motion?

MS. KANE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anyone else wish to be heard?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right. Again I think that this is just another matter of operational common sense. The failure to pay these amounts would result in the imposition of extremely outrageous interest rates -- you can tell I'm a Texas taxpayer -- as well as penalties. Again it just makes -- it makes good commercial sense. I don't have any issue at all. I've had a chance to review the proposed Order.

And, Mr. Ruff, just let me confirm you've had an opportunity to look at the Order and are okay?

MR. RUFF: We have, Your Honor, and we are okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. That Order has been signed and it is off to docketing. Okay.

What's next?

MS. KANE: Thank you, Your Honor. The next item on the Agenda is the Debtor's Motion to extend time to file schedules, statements and Rule 2015.3 reports, which is Docket No. 11. By this Motion, the Debtors are seeking entry of an Order extending the deadlines to file their schedules and statements by 30 days for a total of 44 days from the petition date through and including February 3rd and the 2015.3 reports until the later of 15 days after the 341 meeting or 45 days

from the petition date.

We believe this is appropriate considering the size and complexity of the case. Unless Your Honor has any questions, the Debtors request that the Court enter the Order approving the Motion.

THE COURT: So the only question I have is: I want to make sure that this gives you sufficient time to give me you're a-game by the deadline. We all want these to be right the -- as right as they can be first time out and I don't want to pick a date that's artificial. I want to pick a date that Mr. Ruff can schedule around, that creditors can have confidence when they see the Schedules that they represent the Debtor's best efforts. And if you tell me that this works, I'll accept it. I just didn't want you to propose something because you thought that's what I would do, but it's really not enough time.

MS. KANE: I think we're okay with the dates suggested.

THE COURT: Okay. And I assume, Mr. Ruff, you've previously okayed this.

MR. RUFF: That is correct, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Then anyone else wish to be heard?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right. Then I've had a chance to

1 review the Motion. Again my only concern is that we get these 2 as accurate as they can be by the deadline. I'll accept the 3 representation that this is sufficient time. 4 I'll grant the Motion. I've reviewed the Order. 5 It's been signed and it is off to docketing. What's next? 6 7 MS. KANE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll be turning 8 the podium over to Mr. Fink (indiscernible). 9 THE COURT: Should I have given you a harder time? 10 It sounds like you got away too easy and she just disappeared. 11 I got it. I could ask more questions. 12 MS. KANE: I mean, I'm fine if you're fine. 13 (Laughter.) 14 MS. KANE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. All right. 16 Mr. Fink, good morning. 17 MR. FINK: Good morning, Your Honor. Moshe Fink of 18 Weil Gotshal and Manges, on behalf of the Debtors. I'm told 19 that it's almost lunchtime on the East Coast so I'm going to 20 try to be brief, Your Honor. The first motion that I have is 21 the cash management Motion that's filed at Docket No. 12. 22 Pursuant to the Motion, Your Honor, we request authorization 23 to continue the existing cash management system and what we call a "Bitcoin management system" maintaining existing 24

business forms, intercompany arrangements and company credit

25

cards.

Your Honor, that's a pretty standard cash management motion. The wrinkle that I would just like to flag for Your Honor is that we're also requesting authority to sell Bitcoin in the ordinary course. Mr. Schrock mentioned an important component of this business is mining Bitcoin and then selling the Bitcoin. We think it's ordinary course. We just want to, with an abundance of caution, make sure it was clear that we can continue to do that as described in the Motion.

So with that, Your Honor, I wanted to flag that we discussed the Motion with the US Trustee. We incorporated comments. We did file a revised proposed Order at Docket No. 55 reflecting an additional comments received from the Ad Hoc Group with respect to some reporting under the Motion. At 55-2, there's a redline. And we'd ask -- request that Your Honor enter that Order.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anyone else wish to be heard?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: Mr. Ruff, all of your comments get incorporated?

MR. RUFF: They have been, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I had an opportunity to review the proposed modified Order at 55. I don't have any concerns at all with the request. I think it's

just a necessary part of transitioning into a chapter 11 case on an orderly basis.

And, Mr. Fink, with respect to the request that you made, whether it's ordinary course or not, I don't know. I also don't need to reach that conclusion to -- and as part of its ongoing business. It's clearly set forth in the First Day Affidavit that there's generally a -- that the Bitcoin are liquidated within 48 hours of the award being made and I want that process to continue as the Debtor utilizes its business judgment to make the best possible decisions for the Debtor. And if that -- hopefully that will be sufficient for everyone. If it's not, I'm happy to take some different approach.

Let me ask: with respect to your hearing on the final, do you just want to put that on the 23rd as well or did you want to do something different?

MR. FINK: Your Honor, unless someone on my team tells me otherwise, I would like to keep it on the same date, keep everything together please.

THE COURT: Okay. Anyone on the team want to speak up?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FINK: Mr. Schrock gave the thumbs up,

THE COURT: Okay. Sorry, I was typing. Let me -- I

have the Order up. I am interlineating in paragraph 25 so we'll set the hearing on the final to be January 23rd with deadline of the 17th and I'm going to change -- that says, "2022." We'll change that to 2023.

And the last one I think we said 4:00 o'clock

Central just so it's 5:00 o'clock on the East Coast.

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Those changes have been made. I have signed the Order and it is off to docketing.

Mr. Fink, what's next?

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. The next motion on task is the employee wages Motion that's at Docket No. 6. Your Honor has previewed before the employees are the business here, they're the lifeblood of the business. Healthy employees so there's nothing to talk about.

So pursuant to this Motion, we're seeking to pay certain prepetition obligations owed to employees, about 1.2 million. As discussed in the Motion, there's about 330 employees plus additional members of the temporary workforce. We've spoken to the US Trustee. We've incorporated comments. And with that, Your Honor, we respectfully request that the Order be entered.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anyone else wish to be heard?

(No verbal response.)

THE COURT: All right. Again you know that I believe that this is the most important motion that we hear all day. I don't have any concerns at all. In a business like this, I agree with the comment even more than I normally do that the employees are the business. The institutional knowledge that exists can't be replaced or at least not easily. I don't have any concerns at all.

I've had a chance to review the proposed Order. I have signed that Order and it is off to docketing.

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. Moving on to the next item on the Agenda, it's the NOL Motion at Docket No. 7. The Motion seeks to establish procedures to protect the potential value of the Debtor's tax net operating while carried forward certain other tax attributes.

The proposed procedures with narrowly tailored restrictions and notification requirements with respect to the stock -- with respect to the common stock of Core Scientific and certain options or similar rights to acquire that stock.

Your Honor, I'm happy to -- if Your Honor has any questions. I will let you know that I came armed with a -- with one of my tax colleagues. Mr. Stuart Goldring is in the room with me in case Your Honor has any specific questions.

THE COURT: I don't want him to feel like he came for no purpose. I mean, I can -- I'm happy to engage. I also think that again this process exists to protect everyone and I

think the process that has been employed is rational, it's balanced, it protects all parties, it gives everyone the opportunity and tells everyone how you come back if you want relief from the -- from proposed requested relief.

I do have one question because again this is one of my market certainty issues and I always ask. And if you've made an agreement, I'm not trying to change it, but this is one of those that I believe ought to be done on a final basis because you're going to send this out, people are going to rely on it and if you send out an interim Order, then you run the risk of people go, "Well, we're after that deadline, this Order doesn't mean anything" or you start getting various interpretations.

So unless there is some agreement that I'm not aware of and maybe even if there is, I'd like to understand why we shouldn't do this on a final basis.

MR. FINK: Your Honor, I think that works for us, Your Honor. Mr. Goldring concurs with me.

THE COURT: I really want to ask him something now that I know he'll disagree with just to give him an opportunity, but I won't.

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Ruff, let me ask you: have you had the opportunity to look at 7-2, Mr. Ruff?

MR. RUFF: I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any concerns?

MR. RUFF: No, Your Honor. And I think in the past the way we've dealt with this: as long as parties, if they do have an issue with it, if it's without prejudice for the right to seek relief from the Order, no issues --

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. RUFF: -- of it going final just so there is certainty in the process.

THE COURT: Absolutely. Quite frankly, the Order itself says, "If you want relief from the Order, here's how you go about doing it." And it's that process that I am concerned with because I don't inadvertently want something of value to disappear simply because -- perhaps even acting in good faith. I want to make sure that we don't trip over that. So anyone can come back in and say, "This Order should be modified in the following way for the following reasons," we'll have a hearing and we'll just deal with that. So with that, I have the proposed final Order that was filed at Docket No. 7-2. I've had a chance to review it. Again I think this is one of those market certainty issues.

Mr. Fink, if I could ask you: do you have a copy of the Order available to you?

MR. FINK: Yes, I do, Your Honor. Let me -- yes, Your Honor, right in front of me.

THE COURT: Okay. So what I would like: if you

would go to page 3 -- no, I'm sorry, it's actually page 2. It's just the page numbering is off. The second page. The paragraph that's above the "It is ordered," that page.

MR. FINK: Yes.

THE COURT: If you would go to the line that begins "Notice need be provided," and it reads --

MR. FINK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- "And the Court having reviewed the Motion, the Court having held," I'd like to strike the word "interim" so it just says, "The Court having held a hearing on the Motion."

MR. FINK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I would like to strike the rest of that line, the entirety of the next sentence and then the -- and the next sentence all the way through the semicolon so it would read now that "The Court having held a hearing on the Motion and all objections (indiscernible) to the Motion been withdrawn, resolved or overruled," and then it continues on and in my mind reflects what we have done today.

Do you have any concerns or objections?

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor, that works for us. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. And with that, I have signed the Order as modified on the Record. I do think that the notices and the attachments all again are easy to read or

easily understandable. They accomplish the task in a very balanced, evenhanded way. I have signed that Order and it is off to docketing.

Mr. Fink, what's next?

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. Next is utilities. That's at Docket No. 8. Your Honor, I just wanted to raise just two points about this. In case Your Honor was wondering or noticed this, the utility numbers in this Motion are probably a bit higher than what Your Honor's accustomed to seeing and that's due to what Mr. Schrock talked about before. The amount of power necessary to run this business are large, enormous. So in order to run the data centers and the miners, power is needed.

And the second point I just wanted to flag for

Your Honor is that unlike a, I guess, traditional utilities

motion where we talk about the -- only deposit, a number of

the company's utilities are on prepayment terms already prior

to the petition date and we're just seeking as adequate

assurance to continue that arrangement post-petition.

If you look at the -- if Your Honor looks at the chart at the end of the Motion, the schedule, some will be prepaid, some will get the deposit and the deposit as set forth in the Motion will be about \$6.75 million.

So other than that, Your Honor, we respectfully request that Your Honor enter the Order.

And with respect to these hearings, if my math is correct, I think the 23rd is 30 days out from today so if that's the case, Your Honor, I would just propose to do the utilities hearing at that same hearing as well. I know Your Honor's busy that day so if Your Honor wants to do that another day, that's fine too but --

THE COURT: All makes perfect sense to me. Let me ask first before I respond to the things you said.

Anyone else have a concern about this?

Mr. Ruff?

MR. RUFF: No concerns. We were able to preview the Motion and work through any comments that we had, Your Honor. And we're aware of the Debtor's need (indiscernible) in this market and so no opposition to the Order proposed.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Then, Mr. Fink, number one, I greatly appreciate your pointing out the differences. This is -- and I got it. This is one quite honestly I expect -- it isn't going to surprise me because we never see utilities pop in on these, but if there was ever going to be a case in which they would, this may be the one.

And again I think having the process as a place where people can say, "Well, at least here's where we are," and they can make a business decision as to whether or not they want to look for something different makes just perfect

sense to me. The size of the deposit doesn't bother me at all. I understand the nature of the business and what drives the business.

And I think the process again satisfies the requirements of 366. I think it's balanced and I think it gives parties access to the Court in an expedited fashion if they disagree with the Debtor's proposal.

So I have taken the Order that was attached at No. 8. I have modified paragraph 5, which is your hearing time, to reflect January 23rd at 12:00 noon.

And with that unless, Mr. Fink, you tell me there's something else that I've missed, then I'm prepared to sign that.

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. I just note that Your Honor's point -- we have actually already started receiving inbounds from the utilities and we're talking to them already so the process has kicked off as far as we're concerned.

THE COURT: Great. Then this will just work like it's supposed to.

The Motion -- the Order's been signed and it's on its way to docketing.

MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. So I think the last one for me is at Docket No. -- is at ECF No. 9. It's the Motion to file a consolidated creditor matrix, consolidated

top 30 and relief with respect to redactions of employee info -- of employee information and relief with respect to list of equity holders, Your Honor.

Unless Your Honor has any questions, we respectfully request that the Order be entered.

Your Honor, just on the equity holders piece, obviously it's a publically-traded company with a lot of equity holders. We think that the relief is appropriate on that front.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anyone else wish to be heard?

(No verbal response.)

I'm in the minority, but I'm a believer that we should do more to protect the names, addresses. And while not maybe personal identifiable information under the statute, it is certainly close enough. You just look at events and people who show up at people's houses and targets that occur and scam attempts that go on, I'm of the belief that we should do more to protect that information.

There are no objections to what's been requested here and I'm not -- again not trying to change where we are.

I'm just telling the world that I think we all need to be more sensitive to that issue and do more to protect folks.

I have -- I will grant the Motion. I've signed the

1 Order. Again that's the Order that was attached to the Motion 2 at Docket No. 9. 3 Mr. Fink, what else? 4 MR. FINK: So, Your Honor, just quickly the last two 5 items on the Agenda is Item No. 13. That's the Stretto 6 retention. Your Honor, thank you very much. We saw that the 7 Order on that had been entered. 8 And then the notice of designation as well as 14 9 rounds out the Agenda. 10 So unless -- I would turn it back to Mr. Schrock for 11 any closing remarks unless Your Honor has any questions for 12 me. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Fink, as always, I appreciate your 14 diligence and preparation, quite frankly, the whole team 15 pretty impressive today. I was so awed by the presentations 16 and the professionalism that I didn't decide who to pick on. 17 So the team should get a collective attaboy. And have a good 18 holiday. 19 MR. FINK: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 MR. FINK: Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Schrock? 23 MR. SCHROCK: Nothing else here, Your Honor. 24 very much. 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. So again to

everyone, I know that there are issues that need to be dealt with. I'll reiterate again I am here ready to begin addressing those issues as soon as you're ready to sign your name to a pleading. So I don't want you to think that I shy away from anything or that I want people to settle things. I genuinely don't care. I'm here to resolve disputes and so when you are ready to do that and you'll put your name on a pleading, I'm ready to resolve it. And I understand the importance of this and I'll do my best to clear my Docket to accommodate all of the parties.

And with that, I'm still looking for a DIP Order.

And, Mr. Ferris, you popped on.

Did you have -- have you had a chance to look at it?

Did you have a concern? Do we need to talk or where are we?

MR. FERRIS: So, Your Honor, before we close, I did just want to make the Court aware. And again we've heard your comments and I fully expect the parties to continue to work toward resolving the issues, but we have not actually yet seen the schedule in the Record, schedule M.2.2 so that's still an open issue.

And candidly the way the -- the current definition of the "prepetition equipment lenders collateral" is still, we believe, overly narrow so we still do have an unresolved issue on the way, which is going to be an Order to clarify that there is no timing of the equipment lenders rights.

THE COURT: Got it. Could I ask an accommodation from you, Mr. Ferris, is that I assumed that $-\!\!\!-$

MR. FERRIS: Absolutely.

haven't yet seen that are being floated and client approvals and all the things that are required to occur. If it turns out that you have a problem -- and you can pick your deadline -- if you would just communicate with Mr. Alonzo that says, "Hey, we need a further hearing this afternoon, we need a hearing tomorrow morning or we've reached an agreement" just so I don't worried about it? If you would just send that email? Obviously copy all the other folks who are involved. I would greatly appreciate that. So could I ask you to do that as you see whatever it is you're going to receive?

MR. FERRIS: Of course. And again we will continue

MR. FERRIS: Of course. And again we will continue to work doing all this consensually and hopefully we won't have to let you know that we need additional time.

THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. Schrock's got to go change the thermal paper in the fax machine.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHROCK: Yes, we'll do that, Your Honor. And I'm confident that we'll work out the language. I should have mentioned that we're going to get that around the current issues. We'll let you know, but I'm confident we're not priming the equipment lenders' liens so we'll make sure that

1 that's handled. 2 THE COURT: No, I got it. There are a lot of things 3 going on. I appreciate everyone's again attention, the prep 4 and the fact that I -- you all just do a fabulous job amongst 5 yourselves. 6 Whatever your particular event whether it be 7 Festivus or something else, I wish you all a very happy 8 holiday. We'll be adjourned. 9 (Hearing adjourned at 11:34 a.m.) 10 11 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 12 to the best of my ability produced from the electronic sound 13 recording of the Zoom/telephonic proceedings in the 14 above-entitled matter. /S./ MARY D. HENRY 15 16 CERTIFIED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF 17 ELECTRONIC REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS, CET**337 18 JUDICIAL TRANSCRIBERS OF TEXAS, LLC 19 JTT TRANSCRIPT #66654 20 DATE FILED: DECEMBER 28, 2022 21 22 23 24 25